



BARATTA, RUSSELL & BARATTA
Aggressive Advocates and Trusted Advisors

www.barattarussell.com

*Also member of NJ Bar
#Member Million Dollar Advocate Forum
tBoard Certified Civil Trial Advocate by the National Board of Trial Advocacy
△LLM in Taxation

Anthony J. Baratta*†
tony@barattarussell.com

Kenneth C. Russell, Jr.
ken@barattarussell.com

Andrew P. Baratta
andrew@barattarussell.com

Andrew E. DiPiero, Jr.*†
adipiero@barattarussell.com

Kim Palavoy Kutler*
kim@barattarussell.com

Courtney D. Zeuner*△
courtney@barattarussell.com

The Loft at Woodmont
3500 Reading Way
Huntingdon Valley, PA 19006
Phone: (215) 914-2222
Fax: (215) 914-2118

July 7, 2015

Honorable Mark Falk, U.S.M.J.
United States District Court
District of New Jersey
Frank R. Lautenberg U.S. P.O. & Courthouse
1 Federal Square
Newark, New Jersey 07101

RE: Jagdish Patel and Kishan Patel v. Jignesh Pandya, et al
Civil Action No.: 14-8127 (WJM) (MF)

Dear Judge Falk:

Please be advised that this law firm represents the Defendants in the above-referenced matter.

On June 30, 2015, we filed a Motion to Quash Plaintiffs' Subpoenas to Paren Dixit, CPA and Mita Enterprises, LLC. It has since come to our attention that we must first present the motion to Your Honor by telephone conference call or letter. Therefore, we are formally withdrawing our motion so that we may present the motion to you by this letter.

As you will see in the attached Motion to Quash, Defendants object to the subpoenas because they are vastly overbroad, seek confidential information, and seek information that is not relevant to this case. Plaintiffs' subpoenas are not properly restricted to information regarding CT Pizza, LLC ("CT Pizza"), the business in which plaintiff, Kishan Patel, is involved. Specifically, requests 5-7 of both subpoenas are not narrowly tailored to the facts and circumstances related to this litigation. Since defendant, Jignesh Pandya, has multiply business ventures outside of CT Pizza, the subpoena responses will encompass confidential business information irrelevant to this litigation.


Plaintiffs have no basis upon which to seek confidential business information unrelated to this litigation. Therefore, pursuant to Federal Rule 45(d)(3)(A)(iii), we respectfully request that the subpoenas be quashed or Plaintiffs ordered to reissue the subpoenas to only include CT Pizza.

July 7, 2015

Page 2

Thank you for Your Honor's attention to this matter.

Respectfully,



KENNETH C. RUSSELL

KCR/cz

cc: Rajiv D. Parikh, Esq.
Jignesh Pandya, et al